A20145

May 2. 2011

Office of the Secretary
Postal Regulatory Commission
901 New York Ave. NW Suite 200
Washington, DC 20268-0001

Received

ATTN,: Ms. Annie Kennedy

MAY 3 2011

Office of PAGR

Dear Ms. Kennedy:

On behalf of affected residents, I wish to initiate an appeal of the announced closure of the post office for Gwynedd, PA 19436. This letter will reach your office within the 30 day limit from the final announcement of closure on April 2, and I expect this matter to be assigned a docket number and proceed as provided by law. Please see to it that the appropriate personnel give it prompt attention.

I filled out a commission form with an outline of some key matters in which, affected residents believe, the USPS authorities pushing for this closure did not follow proper procedure and did not correctly state or interpret the facts.

I presume that opportunity to present the affected residents' views in greater detail will be available as the appeal process proceeds.

Thank you for your attention.

Very truly yours,

Christina Surowiec

Christian Survey

(writing on behalf of residents affected by Gwynedd Post Office closure)

BEFORE THE POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, DC 20268

In the Matter of:				
GWYNEDD	PA	19436	:	Docket No:
Post Office	State	ZIP Code		
CHRISTINA	1 SUROWIE	Petitioner(s)	- <u>.</u> .	
ralf of affect	fed resident	tr.)		
	PA	RTICIPANT STAT	EMENT	10
1. Peti the <u>GWYNGD</u>	tioner(s) are app	pealing the Postal S . The Final Determi	ervice's Fin nation was	posted <u>Apr 4, 2011</u> . (date)
the Postal Regulate	ory Commission	pplicable law, 39 U. to review the Posta in the making of the	l Service's	b)(5), the Petitioner(s) request determination on the basis of tion.
Final Determination consideration. (Se requires us to consi	on should be ree pages 1-2 of the ider.) Please be a	reversed and return ne Instructions for a	ned to the n outline of le. Please o	Postal Service's Postal Service's Postal Service for further the kinds of reasons the law continue on additional paper if
Petio	tioner(s)) will co	ntend	1 that the
closure	is arbi	to a		Existing the
		lucity air	ICC CC	pricion, ma
the proc	ess did	// //	11	7
1	ess did	not fo	How Pos	the prescrib
1	e, and	1 not fo that th	llow	the prescrib
1	e, and es have	1 not fo that th	llow	the prescrib
procedur	e, and es have	1 not fo that the not cit	llow	the prescrib
procedur	e, and es have	I not fo that the expreted sure	llow e Pos ed H the	the prescrib
procedur	e, and es have	1 not fo that the not cit	llow e Pos ed H the	the prescrib

argament would go to considerable length,
and is not attempted here. However, in brief
some major issues are stated here:
· Closure announced as "clone deal," not as
opening forum for community input on possible
closure
· Adverse impact on historic old community
· Worst of all USPS closure justification
is based on falsehoods, not facts, in regard
to a) road access situation; (6) status of
lease; and (&) claimed financial savings.
A fair comparison of the relative
advantages and disadvantages of the proposed
replacement facility (Springhouse) and the existing
facility slated for closure (Gwynedd) was never
made.
Important background issues concerning the
Route 202 project and the role of the lessor,
Foulkeways at Gwynedd, are also relevant and were
not given even cursory consideration in the
proceedings to date